

EXHIBIT 6



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.; MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR
PRODUCTS, INC.; and MICRON TECHNOLOGY TEXAS LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

NETLIST, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00418
Patent 8,301,833 B1

Before GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, SHEILA F. McSHANE, and
KARA L. SZPONDOWSKI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SZPONDOWSKI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT
Final Written Decision
Determining All Challenged Claims Unpatentable
35 U.S.C. § 318(a)

IPR2022-00418
Patent 8,301,833 B1

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, we are persuaded that Petitioner established by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1, 3–17, and 19–30 of the '833 patent are unpatentable.¹⁴

In summary:

Claims	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis	Claims Shown Unpatentable	Claims Not shown Unpatentable
1, 3– 17, 19– 30	103(a)	Best, Bonella, Mills	1, 3–17, 19– 30	

V. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that claims 1, 3–17, and 19–30 of the '833 patent have been shown to be unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); and

FURTHER ORDERED that, because this is a final written decision, parties to this proceeding seeking judicial review of our Decision must comply with the notice and service requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 90.2.

¹⁴ Should Patent Owner wish to pursue amendment of the challenged claims in a reissue or reexamination proceeding subsequent to the issuance of this decision, we draw Patent Owner's attention to the April 2019 *Notice Regarding Options for Amendments by Patent Owner Through Reissue or Reexamination During a Pending AIA Trial Proceeding*. See 84 Fed. Reg. 16,654 (Apr. 22, 2019). If Patent Owner chooses to file a reissue application or a request for reexamination of the challenged patent, we remind Patent Owner of its continuing obligation to notify the Board of any such related matters in updated mandatory notices. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(3), (b)(2).